

Remarks:

This amendment is submitted in an earnest effort to advance this case to issue without delay.

The specification has been amended to eliminate some minor obvious errors. No new matter whatsoever has been added.

Claim 1 has been amended by the addition to it of the subject matter of claim 2 and some clarifying language. In addition this amendment places in this case a new claim 7 that is the same as claim 1, but that does not recite the cages and end disks of the rollers.

The application stands rejected on the combination of US 3,993,723 of Davis and US 3,199,934 of VanWyk.

Davis shows an apparatus for blow-extruding a plastic tubes with a calibration system shown best in FIG. 2. Here the plastic tube rides on plastic roller sleeves 20 directly mounted and rotatable on rings 12. Thus this corresponds exactly to the admitted prior art shown in FIG. 3 of the instant application. The disadvantages of this system are detailed in the introduction of the instant application, namely that the two-point mount generates considerable friction leading to roller failure and damage to the workpiece. In addition the sleeves 20 can shift angularly along

the rings 12, so that with time significant gaps can form here and there on each ring 12.

VanWyk shows a roller bearing. Applicant admits that roller bearings have been around for quite a while, but feels that the total lack of any showing of the use of such bearings for the guide rollers of a tube extruder is important. There is no suggestion in Davis that roller bearings could replace the existing slide bearings, and no suggestion in VanWyk that such a roller bearing could be used as a workpiece guide in a plastic-tube extruder. The VanWyk patent dates from 1963 so that if it were obvious to use a roller bearing in 1974 when Davis got his patent, surely this would have been done. Clearly the suggestion to combine these references can only have come from the instant invention, something not permitted for a valid §103 rejection.


Going one step further, even if the teachings of Davis and VanWyk were combined, the system of claims 1 and 7 would not be attained. Both claims recite how the inner bearing is "fixed" on the stirrup. This means it cannot move at all relative to the stirrup, neither angularly by sliding along it nor in any other direction. In Davis the sleeves 20 are shiftable angularly and can slide about on the rings 12. Thus if the bearings of VanWyk were used in the system of Davis, there would be no teaching to fix the inner rings, and eventually the roller bearing would bunch up and create substantial gaps, as described above. Instead the combination would be to have the VanWyk bearings angularly

shiftable on the rings 12, like the sleeves 20 of Davis. The combination of Davis and VanWyk does not therefore meet the language of claims 1 and 7.

For these reasons all the claims in the case are felt to be in condition for allowance. Notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

If only minor problems that could be corrected by means of a telephone conference stand in the way of allowance of this case, the examiner is invited to call the undersigned to make the necessary corrections.

Respectfully submitted,
The Firm of Karl F. Ross P.C.


by: Andrew Wilford, 26,597
Attorney for Applicant

28 March 2006
5676 Riverdale Avenue Box 900
Bronx, NY 10471-0900
Cust. No.: 535
Tel: (718) 884-6600
Fax: (718) 601-1099

Enclosure: Request for extension (one month)